

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/758,720	Applicant(s) KAPUSNIAK ET AL.	
	Examiner Pamela R. Schwartz	Art Unit 1774	

All Participants:

(1) Pamela R. Schwartz.

(2) Mr. Konkol.
Status of Application:

(3)

(4)
Date of Interview: 19 December 2005
Time:
Type of Interview:


- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
none
Claims discussed:
1-19
Prior art documents discussed:
JP 09234948
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPF Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The material disclosed by the reference is not the same as that instantly claimed. It is not made from the same starting material as applicants' material, i.e. a halogenated aluminum, and while the reference discloses amorphous structure and X-ray diffraction, it does not teach or suggest that there are any peaks in the diffraction pattern exhibited by this material. These and other differences would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the material of the reference differs from that instantly claimed..